

Evaluation of bachelor thesis: supervisor's opinion

Author of the thesis: Bc. Lenka Novotná

Title of the thesis: Mechanisms coordinating auxin metabolism and transport

Assessment of individual aspects of work (evaluate with a standard scale 1 to 4)

1. Self-sufficiency of the student:

At the stage of topic refinement: 1

When working with literature and databases: 1

During literature survey (continuity and responsibility): 1

During text processing: 1

2. Communicativeness, ability to cooperate: 1

3. Student's enthusiasm and diligence: 1

4. Reliability and fulfilment of assigned tasks: 1

Possible comments to the above points, additional remarks on the course of work:

Lenka Novotná is very communicative and the collaboration with her is very stimulating. She actively discussed the progression of the work, from the generation of the outline to the final version. She was very concentrated on the bachelor thesis and invested a lot of time into it. She decided to write the thesis in English, which is a difficult task for the generation of the first scientific text. I had to correct a number of inaccuracies, but on the other hand, I evaluate high her ability to generate her own schemes and her independence in writing. It would be good to have a bit more time for the final stage of the bachelor thesis preparation, which was really too short. More time would give her a better chance to make the text clearer, a bit more concise, and perhaps highlighting discussion points on the auxin transport/metabolism "meeting points". The number of references is perhaps too high, which made the overall similarity parameter of "turnitin" very high and made me uncertain about the correctness of the SIS tool. One should set it appropriately (by excluding references from the check) because at the present form, it cannot serve for a proper plagiarism check.

Opinion on the correction(s) of errors:

Errata / correction in the text ~~IS~~ / IS NOT the requirement for the thesis acceptance.

Overall assessment

I recommend the thesis to be accepted for further proceedings: YES / NO

Supervisor's final classification proposal:

1 – excellent

Date: May 24, 2021

Name and surname, signature of the reviewer (according to SIS):

Jan Petrášek